

PATENT
450100-02918**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present response is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, and 11 are independent. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,446,056 to Sadakuni in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,260,016 to Holm, et al. further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,301 to Tackett, et al. and further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,802,488 to Edatsune.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

"...wherein a voice of said speech synthesizing apparatus is a function of said speech synthesizing information and said personality information."
(emphasis added)

Applicants note that the Office Action relies on Holm to disclose the above-recited feature of claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited portions of Holm teach that each word in the dictionary is accompanied by its phonemic representation, information identifying the word syllable boundaries, and information designating how stress is assigned to

PATENT
450100-02918

each syllable (see Holm Column 3, lines 7-40). Furthermore, Holm teaches storing real human speech to be used for sentences that can be stored in advance. Therefore, only target words would need to use unnatural sounds of his invention.

Applicants submit that the text processor 12, associated word dictionary 14 and prosody module 18 do not disclose or suggest a voice that is a function of speech synthesizing information and personality information, as recited in claim 1. Indeed, Applicants submit that the Office Action improperly equates the prosody module 18 with personality information. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the disclosure of a prosody module teaches away from personality information since one skilled in the art would not look to personality information in view of a teaching of a prosody module in conjunction with a word dictionary 14. Furthermore, Applicants submit that the combination of cited art is the result of impermissible hindsight using Applicants' claim as a blueprint. Applicants respectfully submit it is improper to combine art in a mosaic to read on Applications' invention.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, amended independent claims 10 and 11 are also believed to be patentable.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the above-identified reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

PATENT
450100-02918

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of the statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate the portion, or portions, of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By Thomas F. Presson
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800